



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/965,893	09/28/2001	Jeffrey S. Autor	1662-39200 JMH (P01-3593)	3532
23505	7590	03/10/2006	EXAMINER TODD, GREGORY G	
CONLEY ROSE, P.C. P. O. BOX 3267 HOUSTON, TX 77253-3267			ART UNIT 2157	

DATE MAILED: 03/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/965,893

Applicant(s)

AUTOR ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory G. Todd

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 November 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This is a third office action in response to applicant's amendment and request for continued examination filed, 29 November 2005, of application filed, with the above serial number, on 28 September 2001 in which claims 1, 4, 8, 10-12, 17, 22, 27, 32, and 35 have been amended. Claims 1-35 are therefore pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3, 7-9, 12-15, 17-18, 22-25, 27-28, and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ip (hereinafter "Ip", 2003/0046339).

As per Claim 1, Ip teaches a computer server rack, comprising:

a plurality of modular server chassis (10) configured to hold a plurality of computer servers (15), each chassis comprising a chassis controller (30) having a processor and a memory; and

a communications bus internal to the server rack and coupling each of the chassis controllers (55) (at least Fig. 1; paragraphs 22-24);

wherein the chassis controllers transmit and receive a server rack name on the communications bus (at least paragraph 22, 24; unique server / rack identification from coupling); and

wherein the name of the rack is stored in the memory in each chassis controller (at least paragraph 24, 30; identification sent to data collection unit).

As per Claim 2. The server rack of claim 1 further comprising at least one modular power supply chassis configured to hold a plurality of power supplies and further comprising a chassis controller having a processor and a memory (at least paragraph 20, 23, 38; rack power supply).

As per Claim 3. The server rack of claim 1 further comprising an external port in at least one of the computer servers (at least paragraph 22);

wherein the rack name is assigned to the rack via manual input through the external port (at least paragraph 24).

As per Claim 7. The server rack of claim 1 wherein; the memory in which the rack name is stored is flash memory (at least paragraph 30).

As per Claim 8, Ip teaches a chassis controller deployable in a server rack comprising:

a processor (at least paragraph 30);

Art Unit: 2157

a system memory (at least paragraph 30);

a flash memory (at least paragraph 30);

an bus port through which the controller may communicate with other controllers, said bus port internal to the server rack (at least paragraph 30; 24; coupling); and

a device bus port through which the controller may communicate with other devices in the same chassis (at least paragraph 22, 24; rack coupling);

wherein the name of the rack in which the chassis is disposed is stored in flash memory (at least paragraph 24; data collection unit).

As per Claim 9. The chassis controller of claim 8 wherein:

if the controller receives a rack name from the device bus, the new name is written to flash memory (at least paragraph 24).

Claims 12-15, 17-18, 22-25, 27-28, and 32-34 do not add or define any additional limitations over claims 1-3, and 7-9 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4-6, 10-11, 16, 19-21, 26, 29-31, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ip in view of Smith (hereinafter "Smith", 6,792,515).

As per Claim 4, Ip fails to teach each chassis controller further comprises a conflict flag; wherein if a controller receives a rack name from the internal communications bus that differs from the rack name stored in memory, the controller issues a naming conflict message and changes the position of the conflict flag. However, the use and advantages for using such a protocol is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Smith (at least col. 6, lines 12-41). Smith teaches avoiding duplicate geographical addressing for server blades. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Smith's unique server addressing with Ip's system as Ip teaches giving a server or rack a unique MAC address or IP address (at least paragraph 24), as an example, thus if not using the example, it would have been desirable for Ip's system to have another unique naming scheme as similarly taught by Smith.

Art Unit: 2157

As per Claim 5. The server rack of claim 4 wherein the conflict flag is a bit field in the chassis controller (at least Smith col. 6, lines 12-41).

As per Claim 6. Ip and Smith teach the server rack of claim 4 wherein the naming conflict message provides a warning to a server administrator as Ip teaches monitoring the status (at least paragraph 19, 32) and collecting information to be transmitted to a user or technician. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Smith's unique naming method with Ip's remotely monitoring status to produce the desired invention as Ip teaches all monitoring statistics to be transmitted to a user or technician.

As per Claim 10, Ip fails to teach the controller receiving a rack name from the bus, the new name is compared with the rack name in flash memory to check for name conflicts. However, the use and advantages for using such a protocol is well known to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made as evidenced by the teachings of Smith (at least col. 6, lines 12-41). Smith teaches avoiding duplicate geographical addressing for server blades. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of Smith's unique server addressing with Ip's system as Ip teaches giving a server or rack a unique MAC address or IP address (at least paragraph 24), as an example, thus if not using the example, it would have been desirable for Ip's system to have another unique naming scheme as similarly taught by Smith.

As per Claim 11. The chassis controller of claim 10 further comprising:

Art Unit: 2157

if the controller receives a conflict message from the internal bus, the existing name in flash memory is invalidated (at least Smith col. 6, lines 12-41).

Claims 16, 19-21, 26, 29-31, and 35 do not add or define any additional limitations over claims 4-6 and 10-11 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 29 November 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue, substantially, that Ip does not teach a chassis controller having a processor and a memory. Applicant refers to Ip having slots (35) (see Fig. 1) and that the slots do not have a processor and memory. However, Examiner never refers to (35) of Ip. While Ip does have slots (35) that contain a space for a server to be loaded into, this does not pertain to the claims and as such is never relied on by the Examiner.

Rather, Ip is relied on for teaching a plurality of servers (15) being in one or more racks or chassis (10) (see paragraph 20). Each rack has a data collection unit (30) associated with the rack (see paragraph 24) wherein the data collection unit contains a data collection circuit (processor), communication circuit and the associated hardware (inherently some sort of a memory / buffer, as is very well known in the art, a circuit cannot perform alone without some memory) and a network port (bus) over which data is transferred over a network, wherein each data collection unit of each rack is connected to one another over the network (see Fig. 1). Ip further teaches each server being identified with a unique number or code or identifier and each rack / chassis can

Art Unit: 2157

also be identified by an own unique number or code (see paragraph 24). At least for these reasons, Ip teaches the independent claims and Applicants arguments are not deemed persuasive.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Newly cited Irving et al (server chassis having unique identifiers), and Hipp (chassis/ slot address having a physical identifier), in addition to previously cited Bodner et al, Nouri et al, Clubb et al, Sims et al, Hughes et al, Lopez, and Smith are cited for disclosing pertinent information related to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider the prior art reference for relevant teachings when responding to this office action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory G. Todd whose telephone number is (571)272-4011. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 9:00am-6:00pm w/ first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571)272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2157


Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Gregory Todd



Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2100


ARIELLE
PRIMARY EXAMINER